

REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the Office Action dated November 29, 2006. Claims 1-31 were previously pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 15, 20, 24 and 31 were independent. In this response, no claims are amended, no claims are cancelled and no claims are added.

Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on the Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or a subsequent application. Claims 1-31 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action dated November 29, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-25 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Avnet et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0094787). The Examiner rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Avnet et al. in view of Wall (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0027591). The Examiner rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Avnet et al. in view of Walsh et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0050058). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the references as applied to Applicants' claims and traverse the rejections.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the Examiner contends that Avnet et al. teach an apparatus for interactive media display. However, Avnet et al. specifically recite that the display is static (pars. [0005], [0024]). Thus, the Examiner's comparison of the display in Avnet et al. to Applicants' screen is improper, since the display in Avnet et al. does not display content specified by the transceiver. In contrast to Applicants' player controller, which specifies the content of the screen, the transceiver in Avnet et al. merely receives and transmits signals between the user device (16) and the central controller (14). The display is static and remains the same no matter what signals are transmitted. One of skill in the art would not recognize the display in Avnet et al. as an "interactive media display".

Each of Applicants' independent claims recite an "interactive media display". In independent claims 1 and 20, the apparatus includes a "screen for displaying content specified by the player controller". In independent claim 15, the method includes "causing sequential display

of the items on a screen”. Independent claim 24 recites an apparatus including a “screen displaying the received content items”. Independent claim 31 recites a method includes “indicating, on a display screen, a plurality of selectable content items”. As provided above, Avnet et al. do not provide an “interactive media display” where the display on a screen is interactive.

In addition, Applicants’ claim 15 recites “displaying a new content item in response to the received command.” As noted, Avnet et al. disclose a static display. The Examiner contends that Avnet et al. display new content in that the user can view additional text and information. However, the display referred to in Avnet et al. is the display at the user device (16), not the display (20). Both of Applicants’ claim 1 and claim 20 recite a player controller that specifies the content displayed on the screen. As noted previously, the transceiver (18) in Avnet et al. does not specify content for display. Applicants’ claim 24 similarly recites a “player controller receiving content items” and “a screen in communication with the player controller...displaying the received content items”.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 15, 20, 24 and 31 are not anticipated by Avnet et al. and allowance of claims 1, 15, 20, 24 and 31 is respectfully requested. Claims 2-14, 16-19, 21-23 and 25-30 depend respectively from claims 1, 15, 20 and 24 and are allowable at least by dependency.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully suggested that the Remarks herein demonstrate that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly and based on the foregoing Remarks, allowance is respectfully requested. Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants’ Attorney if issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2007
Customer No. 25,181
Foley Hoag LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210

/Robert W. Gauthier/
Robert W. Gauthier, Reg. No. 35,153

Phone: 617-832-1175
Fax: 617-832-7000